

Quantum decoherence effect and neutrino oscillation

C.P.SUN^{1,2} and D.L.ZHOU

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academia Sinica, Beijing 100080, P. R. China

In the view of the quantum dynamic theory of measurement developed from the Hepp-Coleman (HC) model (K. Hepp, *Hev.Phys.Acta*, **45**, 237 (1972)), the quantum decoherence in neutrino flavor oscillation caused by an environment surrounding neutrinos is generally considered in this paper. The Ellis, Hagelin, Nanopoulos and Srednicki (EHNS) mechanism for solving the solar neutrino problem can be comprehended in a framework of the ordinary quantum mechanics. In the weak-coupling limit, a microscopic model is proposed to describe the transition of two neutrino system from a pure state to a mixed state. It gives the modified formula of survival probability of neutrino oscillation with two additional time-dependent parameters. For specified environments, this result shows that the oscillating phenomena of neutrino still exist even without a mass difference in free neutrino.

PACS numbers:14.60.Gh, 03.65.Bz

It is well-known that environment may decohere a quantum system immersed in it, making this system to lose its coherence and to transit from a pure state to a mixed state [1]. Based on the quantum dynamic approach of this environment influences [2], which was developed from the Hepp-Coleman (HC) theory of quantum measurement and its clarified physical representation [3], the decoherence phenomenon is investigated for the neutrino flavor oscillation [4] in this paper.

Neutrino oscillation is a subject of much intense theoretical and experimental research. In comparison with the prediction from the standard solar model (SSM), the deficit of solar neutrinos observed in the earth can probably be explained by neutrino oscillations with a (mass)² difference $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-6} \text{eV}^2$ [4]. Two possible mechanisms were further presented to enhance the vacuum neutrino oscillations. As a matter enhancement effect of oscillations, the Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein (MSW) mechanism [5], was invoked when the neutrinos pass through the sun adiabatically and non-adiabatically [6]. Initialed by Ellis, Hagelin, Nanopoulos and Srednick (EHNS) in 1983 [7], there was another mechanism (now called EHNS mechanism) to modify neutrino oscillations. Similar to the quantum decoherence in generic problem of environment influence [1-3], the EHNS mechanism makes a transition of neutrino from a pure state to a mixed state due to some unknown couplings of neutrinos to the environment surrounding them. Such an environment may be the background field caused by Hawking's quantum gravity effect, like the evaporation of black holes [8]. With irreversible elements characterized by phenomenological parameters, the original EHNS mechanism suggested an effective von Neumann equation of density matrix. Its solutions modify the survival probability of neutrino oscillation. Following this work some significant efforts were made by different authors in preserving the linearity, locality, conservation of probability and unitarity [9]. Notice that the EHNS parameters were determined to some extent either by analyzing the experimental data of CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system [10] or based on further

theoretical considerations, such as the string theory with an Einstein-Yang-Mills black hole in four dimensions [11].

These investigations reflect the successful aspects of the EHNS mechanism in solving the solar neutrino problem. However, as the phenomenological motion equation of density matrix concerns quantum irreversible process, it apparently violates quantum mechanics since the Schroedinger equation is reversible with time-reversal symmetry. As a correct physical theory to solve the solar neutrino problem, the EHNS mechanism has to be consistent with quantum mechanics. To remove this confliction in this paper we show that rationality of the EHNS mechanism is related to the reduction of quantum mechanics for the "universe", a total system formed by the neutrino system plus environment. The physical essence of our observation is that the couplings of neutrino to the EHNS mechanism results in quantum decoherence of the flavor eigenstates of neutrino, which are coherent superpositions of neutrino mass eigenstates if there is not an external influence. Mathematically, this physical process is described by a reduced density matrixes of neutrino system by tracing out over the variables of the environment. The calculation of the reduced density matrixes explicitly leads to a modified formula of survival probability of neutrino oscillation. It not only introduces extra parameters to neutrino oscillation, but also implies a novel dynamic effect that the oscillating phenomena of neutrino may exists even without a mass difference in free neutrino.

Methodologically, the starting point of the present study is the quantum dynamic approach [2] for decoherence problem (or wave function collapse, WFC) in quantum measurement. We recall that, in the traditional theory of quantum measurement, the WFC postulate is only an extra postulate added to the ordinary quantum mechanics. Under this postulate, once we measure an observable and obtain a definite value a_k the state of system must collapse into the corresponding eigen-state $|k\rangle$ from a coherent superposition $|\phi\rangle = \sum_k c_k |k\rangle \langle k|$. Through density matrix this process is described by a quantum

decoherence process $\rho = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \rightarrow \hat{\rho} = \sum_k |c_k|^2 |k\rangle\langle k|$ from a pure state to a mixed state. In quantum dynamic approach, both the measured system and the measuring apparatus obey Schrodinger equation and the dynamic evolution governed by their interaction is supposed to result in quantum decoherence for the reduced dynamics of the measured system under certain conditions, such as the macroscopic limit that the measuring apparatus contains an infinite number of subsystems. Notice that the environment coupling to neutrino usually can be considered as a bath of infinite degrees of freedom. For quantum decoherence, there is a strong resemblance between the neutrino system plus the environment and the measured system plus the measuring apparatus. So we can study quantum decoherence effect in neutrino oscillation by making use of the quantum dynamic approach developed in treating quantum measurement. In the following our discussion will focus on the case of two generations, but it can be easily generalized to the case of three generations.

The neutrino weak interaction (flavor) eigenstates ν_e and ν_μ do not coincide with their mass eigenstates ν_1 and ν_2 with masses m_1 and m_2 . Through a vacuum mixing angle θ , the neutrinos mixture is described as a two dimensional rotation

$$\nu_e = \nu_1 \cos \theta + \nu_2 \sin \theta \quad (1)$$

$$\nu_\mu = -\nu_1 \sin \theta + \nu_2 \cos \theta$$

Without the interaction between neutrinos and other objects, the vacuum neutrino oscillation result from free Hamiltonian

$$H_n = E_1 \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 + E_2 \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2 \quad (2)$$

As a result, the survival probability that an electron-neutrino remain as itself is:

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) \simeq 1 - \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2\left[\frac{\delta m^2 t}{4E}\right] \quad (3)$$

Here $\delta E = E_2 - E_1$, $\delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2$ and we have considered masses of neutrinos are so small that their energy and momentum are very close. The above well-known result was obtained completely from the coherent superposition Eq.(1) of pure states ν_1 and ν_2 and it will be certainly modified if the mixed states of neutrinos were introduced from fluctuating interactions.

Now, we consider the coupling of neutrinos to environment, which may be a background provided by the certain gravity effect such as the Hawking's evaporation of black holes. In general, without referring to the concrete forms of the environment Hamiltonian $H_G(q)$ of dynamic variables q , we can roughly write down the interaction Hamiltonian in the weakly-coupling limit

$$H_I = [\lambda_1 \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 + \lambda_2 \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2] q \quad (4)$$

which is linear for both the density projections $\bar{\nu}_i \nu_i (i = 1, 2)$ of neutrinos and the environment variable q . The coupling constants $\lambda_i (i = 1, 2)$ satisfying $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ implies that the couplings to environment have different strengths for different neutrinos ν_1 and ν_2 . For instance, in the quantum gravity background, perhaps there is $\lambda_i \propto m_i^2$. Up to the first order perturbation for quantum dissipation problem, Caldeira and Leggett [12] have pointed out that, any environment weakly coupling to a system may be approximated by a bath of oscillators with linear interaction in the weakly coupling condition that "each environmental degree of freedom is only weakly perturbed by its interaction with the system". For both quantum decoherence [2,14] as well as quantum dissipation [12,13], we have modeled a general environment with the linear coupling Hamiltonians similar to Eq.(4) and discussed the universality of such modeling scheme.

Because the total system, governed by the total Hamiltonian $H = H_n + H_G + H_I$, is closed, the quantum mechanics can work well to describe its dynamic evolution. Suppose the neutrino is initially in a flavor state ν_e with a pure density matrix

$$\rho_{\nu_e} = \bar{\nu}_e \nu_e = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \theta & \cos \theta \sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \sin \theta & \sin^2 \theta \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

and the environment in a general initial state of density matrix ρ_G , the initial condition for the total system should be :

$$\rho(t=0) = \rho_{\nu_e} \otimes \rho_G \quad (6)$$

By considering the quantum non-demolition features of the interaction, i.e., $[H_I, H_n] = 0$, $[H_I, H_G] \neq 0$, the total density matrix can be directly computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) = & \cos^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 \otimes U_1(t) \rho_G U_1^\dagger(t) + \\ & + \sin^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2 \otimes U_2(t) \rho_G U_2^\dagger(t) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$+ \cos \theta \sin \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_2 \otimes U_1(t) \rho_G U_2^\dagger(t) \exp(i\delta E t) + H.c.$$

where

$$U_i(t) = \exp\{-i[H_G(q) + \lambda_i q]t\} \quad (i = 1, 2) \quad (8)$$

for $i = 1, 2$ are the effective evolution operators of environment. They show that the back-actions on environment exerted by ν_1 and ν_2 respectively are different for different coupling strengths $\lambda_i (i = 1, 2)$. Namely, the environment can distinguishes different mass eigenstates of neutrino.

As our main interest is only in the neutrino oscillation rather than the motion of the environment, we trace out over the variable of environment to obtain the reduced density matrix of the neutrino system. It is

$$\rho_n(t) = \cos^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 + \sin^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2$$

$$+ F(t) \cos \theta \sin \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_2 \exp(i \frac{\delta m^2 t}{2E}) + H.c. \quad (9)$$

of the neutrino system. Here, the decoherence factor

$$F(t) = \text{Tr}_g[U_2^\dagger(t)U_1(t)\rho_G] \quad (10)$$

characterizes the extent that the neutrino system loses its coherence. The reduced density matrix $\rho_n(t)$ determines the survival probability that a electron-neutrino remain in itself is

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) = \text{Tr}_n[\bar{\nu}_e \nu_e \rho_n(t)] \\ = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta) \{1 - \cos[\delta E t + \alpha(t)]|F(t)|\} \quad (11)$$

where the real number $\alpha(t)$ is the phase of $F(t)$. It is easy to prove that $|F(t)|$ is less than 1 since $\text{Tr}[\rho_G] = 1$ and $U_i(t)$ ($i=1,2$) are unitary. In the above concise formula (11) for neutrino oscillation, the influences of environment are simply summed up to a decoherence factor $F(t)$, which is time-dependent while energy-independent. If the difference $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ in couplings of ν_1 and ν_2 to environment does not depend on δm , the difference in their masses, the result (11) directly shows a novel fact that, even neutrino is massless or electron- and muon- neutrinos have a same mass, it is possible to see the oscillational behavior between electron- and muon- neutrino. Here, the neutrino oscillation is caused by the phase $\alpha(t)$ of the decoherence factor, that is

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta) (1 - \cos[\alpha(t)]|F(t)|) \quad (12)$$

As the above derived temporal phenomenon is independent of the energy of neutrino flux, it can not solve the present solar neutrino problem with energy -dependence spectrum .

To get one step further we consider two extreme cases. When $|F(t)| = 1$, or $F(t) = \exp[i\alpha(t)]$ for real α , the system still in a pure state

$$\rho_n(t) = \bar{\phi}(t)\phi(t) :$$

$$\phi(t) = \nu_1 \exp(iE_1 t - i \frac{\alpha}{2}) \cos \theta + \nu_2 \exp(iE_2 t + i \frac{\alpha(t)}{2}) \sin \theta \quad (13)$$

In this case the influences of environment on neutrino oscillation only result in a time-dependent phase shift $\frac{\alpha(t)}{2}$, i.e.,

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) = 1 - \sin^2(2\theta) \sin^2[\frac{\delta m^2 t}{4E} + \frac{\alpha(t)}{2}] \quad (14)$$

As a signature of the environment influence, this phase shift only affects the spectrum distribution $P(E) = p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t)$ in the higher energy region. For an extreme

case with $F(t) = 0$, the coherence in neutrino system is completely lost and the neutrinos transit into a completely mixed state

$$\rho_n(t) = \cos^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 + \sin^2 \theta \cdot \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2 \quad (15)$$

with vanishing off-diagonal elements. It leads to a constant transition probability $\frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta)$ from ν_e to ν_μ and the corresponding survival probability that ν_e remain in itself is $1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta)$. Notice that these results only depend on the vacuum mixing angle θ and do not fit the neutrino spectrum varying with the energy of neutrino.

To get the idea of explicit form of $F(t)$ we illustrate the determination of decoherence factor in the harmonic oscillator model of environment [3,14]. Let a_j^+ and a_j be the creation and annihilation operators for the j -th harmonic oscillator in environment. The Hamiltonian of environment takes the form $H = \sum_{j=1}^N \hbar \omega_j a_j^+ a_j$ and its interaction with neutrino can be modeled as a linear coupling:

$$H_I = [\lambda_1 \bar{\nu}_1 \nu_1 + \lambda_2 \bar{\nu}_2 \nu_2] \sum_{j=1}^N \hbar g_j (a_j^+ + a_j) \quad (16)$$

Let the environment be initially in the vacuum state $|0\rangle_e = |0_1\rangle \otimes |0_2\rangle \cdots \otimes |0_N\rangle$ where $|0_j\rangle$ is the ground state of the j -th single harmonic oscillator, the corresponding decoherence factor

$$F(t) \equiv F(N, t) = \prod_{j=1}^N \langle 0_j | U_2^{\dagger}(t) U_1^j(t) | 0_j \rangle \equiv \prod_{j=1}^N F_j(t)$$

can be obtained by solving the Schroedinger equations of $U_i^j(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) governed by the Hamiltonians of forced harmonic oscillators $H_i^j = \hbar \omega_j a_j^+ a_j + \lambda_i g_j (a_j^+ + a_j)$. The result is

$$|F(t)| = \exp[- \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{2g_j^2(\delta\lambda)^2}{\omega_j^2} \sin^2(\frac{\omega_j t}{2})] \\ \alpha(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{g_j^2 \delta\lambda^2}{\omega_j} [t + \frac{\sin(\omega_j t)}{\omega_j}] \quad (17)$$

where $\delta\lambda = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$, $\delta\lambda^2 = \lambda_2^2 - \lambda_1^2$. The decoherence time is decided by the norm part of $F(N, t)$, which is the same as that from the two level subsystems model of environment in the weakly coupling limit [2]. Especially, when the environment consists of identical particles, we have $\omega_j = \omega$ and $g_j = g$. In the van Hove limit of weakly-coupling, i.e., $g \rightarrow 0, N \rightarrow \infty$, but $g\sqrt{N} \rightarrow$ a finite constant G , a simple result for decoherence factor is obtained as $|F(t)| = \exp[-(\delta\lambda)^2 \frac{2G^2}{\omega^2} \sin^2(\frac{\omega t}{2})]$ and $\alpha(t) = \delta\lambda^2 [\frac{G^2}{\omega^2} t + \frac{\sin(\omega t)}{\omega}]$. Then, an explicit formula of environment-modifying neutrino oscillation is obtained as

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta) \times$$

$$\{1 - \cos[(\frac{\delta m^2}{4E} + \frac{G^2 \delta \lambda^2}{2\omega^2})t + \delta \lambda^2 \frac{\sin(\omega t)}{2\omega}] \times \exp[-(\delta \lambda)^2 \frac{2G^2}{\omega^2} \sin^2(\frac{\omega t}{2})]\} \quad (18)$$

In the low-frequency case of environment ($\omega \rightarrow 0$), denote $\beta = \frac{1}{2}(\delta \lambda)^2 G^2$, we have an exponential decay $|F(t)| = \exp[-\beta t]$ and $\alpha(t) = \frac{\beta}{\omega^2} t$. So

$$p_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(t) \rightarrow 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(2\theta) \times \{1 - \cos[(\frac{\delta m^2}{4E} + \frac{\beta}{\omega^2})t]\} \times \exp[-\beta t]. \quad (19)$$

In conclusion, we have considered the quantum decoherence problem in neutrino flavor oscillation based on our dynamic approach for quantum measurement. The phenomenon of transition of neutrinos from a pure state to a mixed state, similar to EHNS mechanism, has been understood to some extent in the view of the ordinary quantum mechanics. Our study leads to the modified neutrino oscillations with two additional time-dependent parameters. For specified environments, they show that the oscillating phenomena of neutrino still exist even without a mass difference in free neutrinos. However, we have not considered yet the influences of quantum decoherence on the MSW mechanism and the quantum dissipation effects due to the couplings to environment in off-diagonal form $[g\bar{\nu}_1\nu_2 + H.c]q$ [12, 13]. These effects perhaps are crucial to the final solution to solar neutrino problem, and the method used by this paper can be generalized to handle them without any difficult in principle. The main problem in present is that the explicit calculation of the decoherence factor $F(t)$ depends the details of the environment and its couplings to neutrinos in certain extent, but up to date we have not a complete knowledge yet about a complex environment. If the environment is provided by the Hawking's evaporation of black holes in gravity field, there is not yet an universally acknowledged scheme to quantize gravity. Regardless of this problem, the present paper at least suggests a general rule to microscopically analyze the decoherence modification of neutrino oscillation. Once the Hamiltonians of the environment and its coupling to neutrinos, even in the weakly-coupling case, were provided the decoherence factor can be explicitly calculated to fit the datum in the solar neutrino problem.

Acknowledgment: The authors wish to thank T.H. Ho, X.Q.Li, Y.L.Wu and C.H.Chang for many helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the NFS China

¹electronic address: suncp@itp.ac.cn;

²internet www site: <http://www.itp.ac.cn/~suncp>

-
- [1] W.H.Zurek, Phys.Today, **44**(10), 36 (1991).
 - [2] C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A, **48**, 878 (1993); C. P. Sun, X. X. Yi, and X. J. Liu, Fortschr. Phys., **43**, 585(1995); C. P. Sun, H.Zhan and X.F.Liu, Phys. Rev. A, **57**, in press (1998); C. P. Sun, in *Quantum Coherence and Decoherence*, ed. by K. Fujikawa and Y. A. Ono, pp. 331-334, (Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Press, 1996); C. P. Sun, Chin. J. Phys., **32**, 7(1994); X. J. Liu and C. P. Sun, Phys. Lett. A, **198**, 371 (1995); C. P. Sun, X. X. Yi, S. R. Zhao, L. Zhang and C. Wang, Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **9**, 119 (1997).
 - [3] K. Hepp, Helv. Phys. Acta, **45**, 237 (1972); J. S. Bell, Helv. Phys. Acta, **48**, 93 (1975); M. Cini, Nuovo Cimento, **73B**, 27 (1983); M. Namik and S. Pascasio, Phys. Rev., **A44**, 39 (1991); H. Nakazato and S. Pascasio, Phys. Rev. Lett., **70**, 1(1993).
 - [4] S. M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, Phys. Rep. **41**, 225 (1978).
 - [5] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2369(1978) 2369; S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42**, 913(1985); Nuovo Cimento **9C**, 17(1986). For an excellent review see also T. K. Kuo and J. Pantaleone, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 937 (1989).
 - [6] C.P.Sun, Phys.Rev.**D.38**, 2908(1988); P.I. Krastev and A.Yu. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. **338B**, 282 (1994).
 - [7] J.Ellis, J.S.Hagelin, D.V.Nanopoulos and M.Srednicki, Nucl.Phys.**B 241**, 381(1984).
 - [8] S.W.Hawking, Commun. Math.Phys. **43**, 199(1975); Nature **248**, 30, (1974).
 - [9] T.Banks, M.E.Peskin and L.Susskind, Nucl.Phys.**B 244**, 125 (1984); B. Reznik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 119 (1996).
 - [10] CPLEAR Collaboration and J. Ellis et al. Phys. Lett. **B 364**, 239(1995); J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos and D.V.Nanopoulos, Phys Lett.**B 293**, 142 (1992); P. Huet and E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys.**B 434**, 3(1995) and the references therein.
 - [11] J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos and D.V.Nanopoulos, Phys.Lett. **B 293**, 37(1992); J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, E. Winstanley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A12**, 243 (1997).
 - [12] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.), **149**, 374(1983); A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dosey, M. P. A. Fisher and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys., **59**, 187(1987); C. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise*, (Berlin, Springer, 1991).
 - [13] L. H. Yu and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A, **49**, 592 (1994); C. P. Sun and L. H. Yu, Phys. Rev. A, **51**, 1845 (1995); C. P. Sun, Y. B. Gao, H. F. Dong and S. R. Zhao, Phys. Rev. E, **57**, 3900 (1998).
 - [14] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 992 (1995).